



FOREIGN POLICY bulletin

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

VOLUME 38 NUMBER 23

Egypt's New Mood

by Georgiana G. Stevens

Of the many consequences of the 1956 attacks on Egypt by Israel, Britain and France, the most striking is the spur which it provided to Egyptian industrialization. Egypt's subsequent isolation by the Western world and the freezing of its foreign balances in Britain and the United States were designed by the West to reduce President Gamal Abdel Nasser through financial starvation. It was reckoned that whatever Russian aid was forthcoming would eventually complicate rather than improve relations between Egypt and the U.S.S.R. and that Nasser would then discover the errors of neutralism.

This series of developments had a curiously stimulating effect in Egypt. It heightened the sense of urgency among Cairo's economic planners and rallied popular sentiment in support of the Nasser regime. The tasks of immediate reconstruction at Port Said, damaged by the attacks on Suez, became the first of new, more energetic exertions to rebuild the national economy. Moscow's economic aid was welcomed with what now appears in Egypt to have been excessive gratitude. But what Egypt's prevailing anger against the West really did was to catalyze its determina-

tion to achieve much greater self-sufficiency.

This result was first made apparent by the skillful way in which the resumption of Suez Canal traffic took place in the spring of 1957, after the canal had been cleared of wreckage with the assistance of the United Nations. From the outset the Suez Canal Authority demonstrated the competence and pride in doing its job which characterize its operations today. Canal tolls now bring Egypt over \$100 million a year in badly needed foreign exchange. Work is under way to widen the channel and to deepen it. Meanwhile, as a symbol of success, navigation of the canal by Egyptian and other non-Western pilots already ranks first among post-Suez achievements.

Since the Suez crisis industrialization has been accelerated. The Nasser government wants Egypt to become the workshop and supplier of machinery and consumer goods to the rest of the Arab world, which, it is assumed in Cairo, will remain primarily agricultural. The need to industrialize the economy of Egypt so as to employ the country's surplus population has been one of Nasser's driving principles since the military coup of

AUGUST 15, 1959

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED
345 EAST 46TH STREET • NEW YORK 17, NEW YORK

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

July 1952. One of the problems was how to get started. Suez provided the opportunity on grounds of necessity.

The result of this stepped-up industrialization is apparent today to even the most casual observer. In addition to textiles of fine quality and excellent design, the shops are filled with Egyptian-made medicines, furniture, clothing, tires, blankets and paper goods, to name only a few items. The first Egyptian cars, trucks and farm machinery, manufactured with local materials and German technical aid, will soon be on the market.

Egypt's post-Suez shortage of such vital items as oil was eased by its existing oil cooperative society. The post-Suez oil boycott imposed by the West gave this company a chance to begin the distribution of petrochemicals, butane gas and bunker oils previously distributed by Western concerns. With the formation of a new government Petroleum Authority in 1957 the government assumed direction of further expansion and development of the oil industry. A total of \$130 million has recently been allocated for oil projects under the five-year industrialization plan. Italian experts have been enlisted to help build a new oil port at Suez. Nearby is the government's flourishing Petroleum Institute where Arab graduate engineers are being trained in the latest refining and field practices so that they can carry forward Egypt's oil program.

In its plans for education the Egyptian government shows a clear aware-

ness of existing deficiencies. For the first time technical education is being emphasized, with primary education slated for attention next. In 1958 some 2.7 million pupils were enrolled in primary and secondary schools. A system of three-year preparatory industrial schools for tested pupils has been inaugurated. These students are to go on to vocational schools where science, accounting, mechanical drawing and workshop skills are taught. The aim is to train foremen and accountants. It is recognized that Egyptianization of industry will not be possible unless such trained personnel is available.

This many-pronged drive toward the goal of self-sufficiency is having a tonic effect on the country. Further benefits have come from the land reform introduced in 1952. This reform has improved the lives of several million tenants by reducing their rents. It has also given the first purchasers of new land annual increases in income of from 50 to 100 percent.

New Pace for Economy

Judging by the progress made in the last three years, it is possible to be optimistic about Egypt's internal revolution. Measured by Eastern standards, this revolution sets a new pace and points in a new direction. That direction is a mixed economy in which the government, through its over-all Economic Development Organization, will fill in the big industrial gaps which now exist with public funds, but will encourage private investment in every way possible. The EDO is itself a by-product

of the Suez struggle, having been set up to handle the takeover of British, French and Jewish firms sequestered after the 1956 Suez attacks. It now controls all government capital and has been the instrument for buying or selling sequestered businesses to Egyptian companies.

Egyptianization has thus come to have a visible meaning in Egypt today. For the first time, education, transportation, importing, are all in Egyptian hands—and they are there to stay. For aside from their economic value, these enterprises help to fulfill the "search for dignity" so well described by observers in recent books on Egypt such as *Nasser of Egypt*, by Wilton Wynn (Cambridge, Mass., Arlington Books, 1959) and *Egypt*, by Tom Little (New York, Praeger, 1959).

At the same time the Nasser regime seems to regard it as necessary to enlist a wider following at home. The attempt to obtain this support by sponsoring elections for a new Parliament, which started with local elections on July 8, is a first step. However inadequate this step may seem from afar, there is no doubt that within Egypt it is based on a genuine desire to win friends at home; and eventually to share responsibility for a revolution which, if it succeeds, could change the pattern of 20th-century life in the entire Arab world.

Mrs. Stevens, an associate of Middle East Research Associates, has lived and worked in the Middle East and has just returned from an extended visit in that area. She has written frequently for the *Middle East Journal* and the FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN.

Published twice a month by the FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC., 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N.Y., U.S.A. EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE: JOHN S. BADEAU • BENJAMIN J. BUTTENWIESER • JANE PERRY CLARK CAREY • BROOKS EMERY • RICHARD N. GARDNER • WILLIAM P. GRAY • AUGUST HECKSCHER • HAROLD F. LINDER • MARGARET PARTON • STEPHEN H. STACKPOLE • President, JOHN W. NASON • Editor, VERA MICHELES DEAN • Washington Contributor, NEAL STANFORD • Assistant Editor, GWEN CROWE. • The Foreign Policy Association contributes to the public understanding by presenting a cross-section of views on world affairs. The Association as an organization takes no position on international issues. Any opinions expressed in its publications are those of the authors. • Subscription Rates: \$4.00 a year; single copies 20 cents. RE-ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1951 AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N.Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. Please allow one month for change of address. Contents of this BULLETIN may be reproduced with credit to the Foreign Policy Association.



Defense Debate Rages On

The United States is in the throes of a debate over defense which has no equal for complexity, future implications and moneys involved. This debate has been going on for six months and the end is not yet—despite the fact that Congress has finally approved a bill of \$39,228,-239,000. For, whatever the sum, there will be individuals and powerful groups who will view it with genuine alarm—and start the debate all over again.

The first thing, then, to understand about a defense program is that there is no "right" figure for defense. No one—not even the best experts—can say with finality that \$40 billion is right and \$1 billion more or less or even \$5 billion more or less is wrong. The only thing anyone can say is that to the best of his knowledge a given figure is adequate. And this is what is being said by many in Washington—although often with dangerous dogmatism.

It must be borne in mind that \$40 billion or \$45 billion can be spent foolishly or even wasted, and so actually buy less defense and security than \$35 billion or less. Therefore, a given figure is not really the important thing. The important thing is the program it is to finance.

What Does U.S. Need?

But who really knows to the nearest billion, or two, or three, what the United States actually needs for defense? To know this one would have to know the topmost secrets of the Kremlin—for example, whether Nikita S. Khrushchev really believes time is on his side, how badly he may be mistaken about American preparedness and readiness to fight,

just what are the domestic pressures which are pushing him toward or restraining him from war. All anyone can do, all that even President Eisenhower can do, is to reach an estimate based on one's own judgment, experience, intelligence reports and intuition.

How Should Money Be Spent?

Then, there is the second matter—how the money is to be spent. Who can say, without any doubt, that a certain breakdown between the services is the correct one as compared with another; that more should go for missiles and less for manned planes; that the country needs another aircraft carrier more than it needs some more nuclear submarines; that the Army's role in war today is less important than that of the Air Force or the Navy—or than it has been in the past? True, people are constantly saying these things and with Delphian oracle intensity. But the plain fact is that no one really knows exactly what is the best ratio for weapons among the various services and for what kind of wars.

The possibility cannot be ruled out that politics, as well as economics and security estimates, plus the world diplomatic picture, influence one's view as to how much defense is needed. But it certainly was not all politics—if indeed any—that caused General Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff, to criticize bitterly the Eisenhower Administration's defense program.

Nor was it all politics that caused the Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee in its pamphlet, "The Military Forces We Need and How to Get Them," to

"view with alarm" the President's defense program.

The two main points the pamphlet makes are first, that the missile gap, which the Eisenhower Administration accepts with a certain equanimity, cannot but upset political relations around the world when Moscow's advantage is believed to be three to one; and, second, that our defense money must not go solely for nuclear weapons or be allocated on the premise of massive retaliation.

The council argues persuasively that expenditures should be increased to close the missile gap and to increase the country's conventional forces. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the council's unghost-like ghost for this critique, subsequently spelled out his defense views on June 30 at the Colgate Foreign Policy Conference, calling for an additional expenditure of \$7.5 billion a year for the next four or five years to boost ground forces and start a crash program to close the missile gap between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Although the council—and Mr. Acheson—does not speak for the Democratic party (more often than not Democrats in Congress cold-shoulder the council's proposals), it is of interest and possible importance that a number of Democratic Senators have also been attacking the Administration's defense program as "too little and too late."

However, the bill as finally passed reflected the influence of the White House, giving the President \$39,228,239,000 rather than the larger amount the committees had been pressing for.

(Continued on page 184)



Can Latin Americans Be Like Us?

The attention of the United States has been so firmly riveted on Berlin or, at intervals of shooting incidents, on Matsu and Quemoy that Latin America continues to remain a dimly seen backdrop for the drama of world events, in which we have become increasingly involved since World War II.

This remains true in spite of the excitement, which turned out to be very transient, generated by attacks on Vice President Richard N. Nixon during his 1958 visit to some of our Good Neighbors; in spite, too, of the momentary tension created by clashes between the advocates of "liberation" led by Cuba and Venezuela and the few dictatorships still extant in Latin America, notably that of Generalissimo Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

Yet the swiftly moving events in Latin America may, in the long run, prove more serious for the United States than developments in Berlin or on Taiwan. A few examples gleaned from recent press reports illustrate the gravity of the situation.

In its July *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, the United Nations points up a dangerous trend in the world economy—the trend which shows that the rich industrialized nations are growing richer while the poor and underdeveloped countries are at best holding their own, or are growing poorer. Thus the gap between the rich and the poor is widening rather than closing. As a result, while the "terms of trade" have improved by 3 to 11 percent for the industrialized nations, the same terms have fallen by 10 percent for the Far East and by 12 percent for Latin America. To compound the difficulty, population

is increasing most rapidly in some of the worst-affected areas, particularly Latin America. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Latin American countries which increasingly suffer from the "gap" should also become prey to political and social unrest.

The "Gap" and Unrest

That this unrest often serves the interests of communism is indicated by a report issued in July by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) from its headquarters in Brussels. According to this country-by-country report, never before has the danger of communism been so great and have trade unions in South America been so Communist-infiltrated.

The ICFTU points out one particularly tragic aspect of the situation, saying that Latin American people "tend to expect immediate solutions to all their political and economic problems when they pass from dictatorship to democratically elected governments." The dangerous stage is reached when people learn to have "rising expectations," but the state is not yet prepared to offer the human welfare institutions which exist in the West and, on a different scale, also in the U.S.S.R., and does not command sufficient internal strength to enforce the regime of austerity which might make at least a modest degree of development possible. No sooner is one government overthrown than its successor, however idealistic its aspirations, suffers a similar fate.

The result of this painful confrontation between hopes and realities in Latin America, as in Asia and

the Middle East, is to produce a series of dangerous explosions, as Tad Szulc of *The New York Times* shows in describing the uneasy situation in the Caribbean. "The violent dispute of the Dominican Republic with Cuba and Venezuela," Mr. Szulc wrote in "The News of the Week in Review," of July 12, 1959, "—which is further compounded by pressures and threats involving half a dozen other Caribbean countries—has turned into an acutely fundamental situation affecting all American governments and subjecting the inter-American political system to one of its severest tests since its inception at the end of the last century."

Why Are They Different?

Why, we often ask ourselves in North America, do Latin Americans behave so differently from us? Why are they not staid, law-abiding, allergic to revolutions, free from emotion about nationalism and domestic politics? Why, in short, to paraphrase Henry Higgins' plaintive question in *My Fair Lady* about women, "why aren't Latin Americans more like us?"

A powerful and eloquent answer to this persisting question is given by the distinguished Brazilian sociologist, Gilberto Freyre, in his book, *New World in the Tropics: The Culture of Modern Brazil* (New York, Knopf, 1959). Freyre goes to the heart of the problem by pointing out that Latin Americans are not, as is generally assumed in North America, at the same stage of development as the people of the United States and Western Europe! "Most of the Latin

(Continued on page 184)

How Dangerous Is Nuclear Fallout?

NEW STUDY SHOWS A RISE IN FALLOUT

WASHINGTON, April 5 — The intensive Soviet atomic test series of last autumn resulted in a sharp increase of radioactive material in the air over the eastern United States in the first part of this year.

New sampling figures disclosed today that at some points along the Eastern Seaboard, such as Washington and Miami, the concentration of radioactivity in the air has jumped by as much as 300 percent over the levels prevailing before the Soviet tests, which were held in the Arctic.

The new sampling was by the Naval Research Laboratory and its figures bear out estimates by Dr. Willard F. Libby, scientist member of the Atomic Energy Commission, that the Soviet tests deposited an extremely large amount of radioactive material in the stratosphere. They are also the first figures available tending to confirm a new theory that stratospheric fallout from Arctic tests can be expected to return to earth at a faster rate than had been calculated.

The Atomic Energy Commission, which samples the fallout that reaches the ground, does not yet have any definite data for the first three months of this year. This information, which is expected to be crucial in calculating future fallout levels, is expected to be available by early next month, when Congressional hearings on fallout begin.

From September 30 to October 25 of last year the Soviet Union exploded 14 atomic devices at its atomic test site above the Arctic Circle. The test

series was, according to an estimate made recently by Dr. Libby, one of the most radioactively "dirty" ever held and it about doubled the amount of radioactive debris in the stratosphere.

The Naval Research Laboratory operates 21 stations along the 80th Meridian in North and South America to measure the radioactivity in the air at ground level. Its samplings show the following:

In September, immediately preceding the Soviet test series, the average concentration of radioactive material in the air was three atomic disintegrations per minute per cubic meter of air at Washington and about four disintegrations at Miami.

Concentrations Increase

In October the concentrations jumped to a peak of 14 disintegrations at Miami and seven in Washington. In November the level at Miami was 15 disintegrations and at Washington 12 disintegrations.

In December the concentrations dropped slightly, but then climbed back in January and February.

The decline in December, followed by the absence of peaks but still a generally high level in the northern latitudes, may prove to be of particular significance in predicting future fallout patterns from the Soviet test series.

The findings are discussed by Dr. Luther B. Lockhart, Jr., head of the physical chemistry branch of the Naval Research Laboratory, in the February issue of *Research Reviews*, publication of the Office of Naval Research.

While the Big Three—the United States, Britain and the U.S.S.R.—continue to wrestle at Geneva with the problems of control and inspection of nuclear tests, the public in Western countries remains deeply concerned with the dangers of fallout. How great are these dangers, not only for those now living, but also for the future of mankind? On this critical question even the best-qualified experts disagree, as indicated by the following reports from *The New York Times* by John W. Finney.

He declares that, although there has been an unusually high concentration of radioactivity in the air in recent months, this airborne radiation poses no dangerous external radiation hazard to man.

He points out that the radioactivity in the air created by atomic tests is only a small percentage of the total atmospheric radioactivity resulting from naturally occurring materials, such as radon gas. The additional external dose resulting from fallout in the air, therefore, is "inconsequential," he argues.

The primary hazard from atomic fallout, he asserts, is not from the external radiation received from atomic debris floating in the air but from the strontium 90 that accumulates on the ground and then is absorbed into the food chain and becomes deposited in the human body.

In comment on the samplings that have been made some fallout experts say that the peaks of October and November could have been created by atomic debris caught in the earth's lower atmosphere, the troposphere. The material from this tropospheric fallout is distributed around the world within a month or two, usually in the same geographic latitude as the atomic test site.

The higher levels that appeared again in January and February, it is said, may have been caused by stratospheric fallout. It is the material deposited in the stratosphere—principally by hydrogen bombs—that accounts for the long-term global atomic fallout.

The new theory concerning atomic debris residence time in the strato-

sphere was offered by Dr. E. A. Martell of the Air Force's Cambridge Research Center in Massachusetts.

He suggested that radioactive debris introduced into the stratosphere by Arctic tests such as the Soviet tests returns to earth in a period of a year or less.

PANEL DOWNGRADES STRONTIUM 90 PERIL

WASHINGTON, April 22 — The nation's highest advisory committee on radiation protection revised substantially downward today its estimates of the danger posed by radioactive strontium 90.

The committee doubled its estimate of the amount of strontium 90 that could be allowed to accumulate in the human body without causing an "unacceptable" hazard. It also increased by 25 percent the maximum permissible concentrations of the radioactive material in water, food and milk.

The recommendations, which indirectly cast a new and somewhat more hopeful light on the dangers of radioactive fallout, were made by the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements. They were contained in a new handbook on the maximum permissible concentrations of radioactive materials in the human body and in air and water.

The committee is composed of 42 representatives of governmental and professional organizations involved in the medical, industrial and military uses of radiation. It acts as the nation's leading advisory committee in establishing radiation-safety standards.

Since its formation in 1929 the committee has been headed by Dr. Lauriston S. Taylor, chief of the atomic and radiation physics division of the National Bureau of Standards.

Although the recommendations of the committee are only advisory, it

was expected that the proposed new standards would be adopted by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Public Health Service as official radiation-safety codes, as they have been in the past.

The new handbook is the result of five years of work by a subcommittee on permissible internal doses headed by Dr. K. Z. Morgan of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The committee's new report establishes maximum permissible concentrations for some 240 radioactive materials, compared with some 75 radioisotopes included in a handbook issued in 1953.

Probably the most significant revision made by the committee dealt with strontium 90, the long-lived radioactive material produced in atomic explosions that constitutes one of the major hazards of atomic fallout. Chemically akin to calcium, strontium 90 tends to concentrate in human bones, where it can cause bone cancer and leukemia.

The effect of the committee's recommendations was to double the estimated amount of strontium 90 that can accumulate in the human bones before body damage is likely.

At the same time, however, the committee lowered its estimate of the permissible level in the human body of cesium 137, another long-lived radioactive substance found abundantly in atomic fallout. Unlike strontium, cesium tends to distribute throughout the entire body and its muscles, and thus can cause genetic as well as body damage.

For atomic workers the committee raised the maximum permissible level of strontium 90 in the human skeleton from one to two microcuries. A curie is a basic unit of radiation measurement and a microcurie is a millionth of a curie.

For populations around atomic facilities the maximum permissible concentrations would be one-tenth

those permitted atomic workers.

The committee has established no specific levels for populations as a whole, but the general guideline has been to limit general-population exposures to one-tenth that allowed atomic workers.

By the new standard, the concentrations of strontium 90 in the bones of young children in regions of greatest fallout is now about one one-hundredth of the permissible levels.

In defining "permissible levels" the committee has emphasized that this does not mean a "safe" level, below which no damage will occur and above which radiation damage is inevitable. Rather, a "permissible level" has been interpreted to mean a "tolerable" level of exposure that should result in little, if any, damage.

Dr. Taylor stressed that the new levels did not constitute "safety" standards. Under the new concentrations, he said, there may still be some damage but the hazards are reduced to "acceptable levels."

STUDY MINIMIZES FALLOUT DANGER

WASHINGTON, May 7 — The Atomic Energy Commission's principal advisory committee presented a reassuring picture today of the dangers of atomic fallout. It commended the commission's handling of the radiation problem.

In a special report to the commission the General Advisory Committee pointed out that the radiation received from atomic fallout caused by weapons tests thus far would be less than 5 percent of the radiation from naturally occurring radiation or from medical X-rays.

The report was requested by John A. McCone, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, last March, after expressions of public concern over the dangers from fallout from atomic tests. In particular Mr. McCone asked the committee to review the

problems of fallout and the activities of the commission and other government agencies in dealing with radiation problems.

The committee, composed of nine prominent scientists, is headed by Dr. Warren C. Johnson, dean of physical sciences at the University of Chicago.

The report was presented to a Joint Congressional Atomic Energy subcommittee, which is holding hearings to review the latest scientific information and appraisals of the fallout problem.

Further reassuring reports on fallout were presented today by scientists testifying before the subcommittee. At the same time it was conceded by the scientists that there still was considerable uncertainty over the physiological and genetic effects of fallout radiation on the human body.

Meanwhile, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota Democrat and chairman of the Senate Disarmament subcommittee, proposed that the present impasse over an atomic test ban might be broken by having a year-long trial of an international detection system before fixing a limit of the number of on-site inspections.

The Senator made his proposal in a letter to Douglas Dillon, Undersecretary of State, on April 30. He made it public today in a speech on the Senate floor.

Among those testifying were Dr. Austin M. Brues of the Argonne National Laboratory and Dr. Lloyd W. Law of the National Cancer Institute.

The report of the General Advisory Committee made no categorical appraisal of the exact threat posed by fallout. The committee said that "the present state of knowledge does not permit a full evaluation of the biological effects of fallout."

To place the hazard of fallout "in proper perspective," however, it pointed out that the amount of ex-

ternal body radiation resulting from fallout from all atomic tests thus far would be:

Less than 5 percent as much as the average exposure to cosmic rays and other background radiation to which persons are normally exposed.

Less than 5 percent of the estimated average radiation exposure of the American public to X-rays for medical purposes.

No Hazard in Food

The committee also noted that the amount of radioactive strontium 90 found in food and water was "less of a hazard" than the amount of radium "normally present in public drinking water supply in certain places in the U.S. and in public use for many decades." It was referring in particular to the well water supplies in certain parts of Illinois.

In answer to Congressional charges of suppression of fallout information, the committee found that the commission "has released all significant fallout data" to the public.

The committee, which in the past has been critical of the commission's research program, found that the level of research on radiation standards and protection had been "quite adequate."

At the same time, however, the committee recommended a major shift in responsibilities for protection of the public against radiation. It said that Federal and local public health agencies should gradually assume responsibility for regulating all public radiation hazards.

The other members of the Advisory Committee are Dr. Jesse W. Beams, chairman of the physics department at the University of Virginia; Dr. Manson Benedict, professor of nuclear engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. James W. McRae, vice president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and Dr. Eger

V. Murphree, president of the Esso Research and Engineering Company.

Also, Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, dean of the College of Chemistry at the University of California; Dr. J. C. Warner, president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology; Dr. Robert E. Wilson, former board chairman of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana; and Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of mathematics at Princeton University, who served as consultant to the committee.

The hearings before the congressional subcommittee have developed that there is now general scientific agreement on the patterns of atomic fallout and how much fallout material can be expected to accumulate in human bodies. Today's hearings demonstrated, however, that there was still uncertainty over the effects of this low-level fallout radiation once it strikes the human bones and tissue.

In particular, the scientists said they still did not know whether the body damage was directly related to the amount of radiation or whether there was a "threshold" level below which radiation will not cause physiological damage.

Drs. Brues and Law agreed that present inadequate evidence pointed to the existence of a threshold.

On the potential genetic damage, the scientists said that evidence still supported the belief that any amount of radiation could cause mutational or hereditary changes.

Dr. James F. Crow, a geneticist at the University of Wisconsin, said that with the present levels of fallout the amount of genetic damage will be "an extremely minute fraction of the total human death, disease and misery." However, he warned that if the past testing rate continued, "it is likely that tens or hundreds of thousands or more persons will be diseased, or deformed, or die prematurely."

Newsletter

(Continued from page 179)

Many on Capitol Hill still feel the President's defense program needs revamping and restudying, with these groups still thinking that more should go for ballistic missiles, more for a modern army which can fight local conventional wars, more for antisubmarine defenses and more for military research and development.

As already pointed out, the results of the defense debate at this session of Congress will not actually be an end but only the beginning of another debate on defense—and another and still another.

NEAL STANFORD

Spotlight

(Continued from page 180)

American peoples," says Freyre, "are going through an aggressive anti-European or anti-Anglo-American phase of nationalism which places them in almost the same sociological situation as some of the modern Asians and Africans." He believes that "national maturity has been reached by comparatively small groups in the Latin American populations, not by any of these populations as national wholes."

In a comparison which will startle most North American readers, Freyre advances the thesis that his

own country, Brazil, is today becoming "a tropical China." In appraising the problems of Brazil, Freyre says, "Perhaps in the treatment of some of these problems, modern Chinese and Oriental leaders are being wiser than Brazilian politicians, most of whom have not yet realized that the task of modernizing such a tropical China as Brazil is in some respects is a very complex one, not to be accomplished only by politicians, engineers and architects." At the same time, he does not believe that communism, "especially of an Oriental or Asiatic type," would be suited for Brazil, whose civilization, "though not European or passively sub-European, is too Western and, from a sociological point of view, too Christian to admit that solution."

Freyre goes on to suggest a way of reconciling North America and Latin America through mutual acceptance of their respective values. "Some Brazilians think today that inter-Americanism should not mean a mechanical and narrow form of standardization with emphasis on the massive, quantitative or monolithic Pan American aspects of values and cultural styles, but a healthy, though difficult, combination of differences and even of antagonisms within a dynamic inter-American structure or system. Just as Latin Americans should take from the United States and adapt to their dif-

ferent regional or national conditions some United States values and techniques, so the Americans of the United States might profit from Latin American suggestions and examples instead of rigidly adopting the attitude that because they lead in industrial progress, they are, or should be, the absolute leaders of everything in hemispheric culture, that hemispheric culture should follow their example in every human or cultural activity."

As one reads Freyre and other Latin American writers, it becomes increasingly clear that most North Americans have so far gone little below the surface of headlines to learn the psychology, the aspirations, the anxieties of the Latin Americans, and judge them mistakenly in terms of our experience rather than their own—an experience which brings them closer, in many respects, to non-Western peoples than to us.

To check "anti-Yankeeism," Freyre suggests a scientific study of North America's relationship with Latin America, "that should take into consideration not only political or economic matters, through statistics and figures, but also social, cultural and psychological aspects of the same total and complex situation." This proposal is a challenge to the wisdom and imagination of scholars and foundations in the United States.

VERA MICHELES DEAN

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

In this issue:

Egypt's New Mood—G. G. Stevens.....	177
Defense Debate Rages On—N. Stanford.....	179
Can Latin Americans Be Like Us?—V. M. Dean.....	180
How Dangerous Is Nuclear Fallout?.....	181

In the next issue:

A Foreign Policy Report—

Iran: Again a Bridgehead,

by Jane Perry Clark Carey

and Andrew Galbraith Carey

MR. PAUL MANLEY
17917 SCHENELY AVE.
CLEVELAND, 19, OHIO

PBN-3

CL